DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 185 24 TE 001 338

Unit 1204: The Evaluation of Persuasive Discourse.
Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Curriculum Development in English.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0658
Pub Date 68
Contract-OEC-SAE-3-10-010
Note-45p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.35
Descriptors-Content Analysis, Critical Thinking, *Curriculum Guides, English Curriculum, *English Instruction, Evaluation Methods, Evaluative Thinking, *Grade 12, Instructional Materials, *Language, Literary Criticism, Propaganda, *Rhetoric, Secondary Education, Speeches, Teaching Guides, Teaching Methods
Identifiers-Minnesota Center Curriculum Development in English, *Project English

This unit for grade 12 is intended to provide an introduction to the criticism of persuasive discourse. After a brief discussion of the definition of criticism, the unit proceeds to the establishment of standards for evaluating persuasive discourse, standards involving Kenneth Burke's pentad: act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. The unit then deals with three categories of discourse which can be evaluated--the single speech or article, the persuasive discourse of a person, and the persuasive discourse of a movement. To aid in the process of criticism itself, a format of questions is set up to require the students to place the speech in a meaningful context, to analyze the speech itself, and to assess the effects of the speech. Finally, this format is used in a sample analysis of Douglas MacArthur's "Address to Congress." Procedural notes for the teacher, lectures, and discussion questions are included. (JS)

ED028185

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Unit 1204

# The Evaluation of Persuasive Discourse

Grade Twelve

## CAUTIONARY NOTE

These materials are for experimental use by Project English fellows and their associates who contributed to their development.

**********

These materials were developed by the Project English Center of the University of Minnesota under a special contract with the Cooperative Research Division of the U. S. Office of Education, effective prior to July 14, 1965. All publication rights are reserved.

TE 001 338

## Materials Needed

Arnold, Ehninger and Berber, eds., The Speaker's Resource Book (Chicago, Scott Foresman and Company, 1961).

_____, and Haverman, Frederick W., The Speaker's Resource Book (Chicago, Scott Foresman and Co., 1961)

Hochmuth, Marie. American Speeches (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954).

# UNIT ON THE CRITICISM OF PERSUASION

## INTRODUCTION TO THE TEACHER

The purpose of this unit is to provide an introduction to the criticism of persuasive discourse. While it is geared primarily to spoken discourse, especially to the speeches of persuaders, this limitation is not meant to suggest that in this unit the teacher and student should not be concerned with written persuasive discourse. That persuasive discourse is prominent in literature may be indicated by simply reflecting on the works of Jonathan Swift, Aldous Huxley, and George Orwell, to name a few. The student in this unit could profitably explore such persuasive discourse as George Orwell's 1984 or Animal Farm.

This unit is designed especially to serve as a follow-up to and application of the units on Argumentation (1103), Persuasion (1102) and Evocation (1202). The unit is constructed so that the student, if the teacher desires, could do a term project by analyzing the persuasive discourse in a single speech, the persuasion of a person, or the persuasive discourse of a movement. A set of sample questions has been provided along with a speech (MacArthur's Address to the Congress) to which these questions have been applied. Sample student responses have been included in the discussion sections of the unit, but these should be viewed as desired responses rather than expected responses. Student discussion of these questions will probably range far beyond the responses suggested, and the discussion questions should be considered only a starting place for actual class discussion. From the class discussion, the teacher will probably want to draw responses somewhat similar in content to those indicated in parentheses. In some cases, additional questions by the teacher may be necessary. In other, the teacher may find it necessary to provide the answers suggested.

In the process of class discussion, the teacher may find that students do not fully understand material that has been assumed in this unit. To review that material, the teacher may want to refer to:

Unit 1002 -- The Modes and Functions of Discourse
Unit 1003 -- The Language of Exposition
Unit 1102 -- The Language of Persuasion
Unit 1103 -- The Nature and Evaluation of Argument
Unit 1202 -- The Language of Evocation
Unit 1203 -- The Social and Psychological Implications of Language

The appendices to this unit, as well as the appendices to the units on persuasion and evocation, contain persuasive materials which are available for analysis. The appendices to this unit also contain excerpts from two analyses of Lincoln as a persuader, and one excerpt from Kenneth Burke's analysis of the persuasion of Hitler. Finally, a sample analysis of the persuasion of the America First Committee--a movement--is provided, an analysis which utilizes the productive insights of Kenneth Burke.

For the teacher who wishes to read additional materials on criticism, primarily on the criticism of speeches, a short bibliography is appended.

## NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The term "data" as it is used in this unit, is a more accurate reflection of the Toulmin system than is found in Unit 1103 -- The Nature and Evaluation of Argument. In Unit 1103 the term "evidence" is used as a general category, with "data" being subordinate to it. In this unit the term "evidence" is not used, and "data" is used in its place. If students are confused, tell them that "data" as it is used here, is the same as "evidence" in the eleventh grade unit. The eleventh grade unit was written with that terminology under the assumption that the term "evidence" would be easier to understand in an introductory unit.

# OUTLINE OF CONTENT

I. Introduction: What is criticism?

II. The five terms of dramatism from Kenneth Burke

- A. Act
- B. Scene
- C. Agent
- D. Agency
- E. Purpose

III. Materials for the analysis of persuasive discourse

- A. Analysis of a single unit of persuasive discourse
- B. Analysis of the persuasive discourse of a person
- C. Analysis of the persuasive discourse of a movement

IV. A format for the analysis of a single speech

- A. Placing the speech in a meaningful context
- B. Analyzing the speech itself
- C. The effects of the speech

V. Analysis of MacArthur's "Address to Congress"

VI. Bibliography

SAMPLE INTRODUCTORY LECTURE

The teacher may read this lecture as it is presented, or modify the opening statements to serve his purposes.

Have you ever gone home and commented, "The teacher criticized me today"? What did you mean when you made that comment? Probably you meant that the teacher pointed to a deficiency or shortcoming of yours. We commonly mean when we say "he criticized me" that the person doing the criticizing was making negative statements. It seems just a bit humorous to hear a statement like this: "She criticized me: she said I spoke brilliantly."

Yet if we limit criticism to negative comments, we miss a crucial part of criticism. Perhaps we should ask, "What is criticism?"

We have already suggested one part of a definition of criticism: criticism is a kind of commentary. Suppose you hear a speech and are asked to criticize. You comment, "It was okay," or "I have a headache." Here we have a commentary, but we do not have real criticism. To be criticism, commentary must be evaluative; that is, it must apply some standards of critical judgment to persuasive discourse.

We do not all have the same critical standards or apply them in the same way, of course. Two critics may view the same play: one critic will praise it and the other will despair. Similarly, when you hear a speech of one of your class members, you will probably respond differently from other members of the class hearing the same speech, even if you are asked to use the same criteria for evaluating persuasive discourse.

The teacher may want to refer the student back to applicable materials in the unit on evocation.

In other words, the lack of uniform judgments should not be an indication that no critical standards have been employed. On the other hand, a similar response from two critics does not necessarily mean that they have used the same criteria in evaluating persuasion, or have applied them in the same way.

Thus, if criticism is a type of commentary in which some evaluative standards are applied, we need to ask, "What are these standards for the evaluating persuasive discourse?"

Perhaps we can best begin to answer this question by reviewing something we discussed in the unit on evocation. Kenneth Burke suggested a framework in which to view discourse: which we called the pentad.

NOTE: The teacher here may want to review the materials by Burke in the unit on evocation.

Remember the terms of the pentad? First we had Act (or what was done?). Next we had Scene (or when and where was it done?). Third we had Agent (or who did it?). Fourth we had Agency (or how did he do it?) Fifth we had Purpose (or why did he do it?).

Sample Lecture-Discussion

Let's take the "purpose" point of the pentad and apply it to the criticism of persuasive discourse. The first question we might ask in this category is "What is his purpose?" Can you think of any problems we might have in determining the persuader's purpose?

NOTE: The class may suggest more than the two major problems, but the teacher should encourage rather than discourage additional responses.

1. The persuader might not state his purpose.
2. The persuader might state a certain purpose which is not his "real" purpose. (Jonathan Swift, for example, says his purpose is to get us to accept the eating of the children in "A Modest Proposal," but this is clearly not his real purpose.)

Sample Lecture-Discussion Continued

Let us suppose we can determine a persuader's purpose, what then? A second question the critic might ask is, "Did the speaker accomplish his purpose?" This question presentes one of the most difficult problems the critic will face. Can you think of some problems the critic might find here?

(Quite often there is no way to tell whether or not the speaker accomplished his purpose.)

If the purpose of a persuasive speech is, let us say, to convince us that we should support the recognition of Red China, how do we know if the speaker has been successful?

Well, we could ask the audience. But this is a difficult task to accomplish even with a small, immediate audience. One such instrument we might use to find out if the speaker accomplished his purpose is called the Shift-of-Opinion Ballot. It is given to the audience both before and after the persuasive attempt in order to determine if the audience's attitudes changed. It would look like this.

Given to the audience before the speech (It is usually collected before the speaker begins).

Proposition: The U.S. should recognize Red China.
(Please circle your opinion.)

| Unfavorable | | | Nuetral | | | Favorable |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |

Given to audience after speech.

Proposition: The U. S. should recognize Red China.
(Please circle your opinion.)

| Unfavorable | | | Nuetral | | | Favorable |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 |

Lecture-Discussion Continued

While this shift-of-opinion ballot may give us some indication of whether or not the speaker accomplished his purpose, it has some pitfalls. Can you think of some of them?

1. It assumes that people will report what they actually believe. There is some reason to believe that some people respond in ways that they think are "socially acceptable" rather than giving their actual opinion.

2. It is difficult to use for the situation where the audience is gathered in a particular room. Some people resent poll taking of any kind. But think of the difficulty of using it on a speech before a national television audience. Think of using it in a situation where the persuasion is to be read, and we cannot be sure who reads it or when it is read. These are certainly limitations on attempting to determining whether or not the speaker accomplished his purpose.

But let us assume that we could overcome the problems of 1) determining the persuader's purpose and 2) of determining of whether or not (or to what extent) the persuader accomplished his purpose. Can you think of any problems which might plague the critic in terms of judging or evaluating the persuasion solely in terms of purpose and effect?

1. The purpose may have been inappropriate for the audience. Suppose a speaker in America, for example, tries to persuade us that we ought to embrace Communism. We might argue that the persuader chose values which were inappropriate to his audience.

2. His purpose may have been inconsistent with the values of our society. This is not really greatly different from the example above, except that it is broader. One might, for example, try to persuade us about something appropriate to a specific audience, which is still appropriate to the values of society. A speaker before the Klu Klux Klan might fit this category. We are all familiar with the leader of a mob (on TV if not

Lecture-Discussion Continued

elsewhere) trying to persuade a crowd that "the dirty horse thief" ought to be lynched--immediately. Here the critic might argue that the speaker, in trying to deny one man the right of freedom of trial by jury, should be rejected for choosing purposes inconsistent for a democratic society.

What we have suggested is that the critic of persuasive discourse should assess the merits of the persuader's purpose relative to:

A. The Persuader himself
B. The Scene
C. The Audience

In other words, these three represent perspectives by which we can assess the merits of the persuader's purpose. One of the goals of the Burkeian pentad we will be studying is to maintain this kind of perspective. Yet the critic is always encouraged to assess the merits of the speaker's purpose, regardless of the perspective from which he chooses to view that purpose.

Perhaps the critic will be convinced that the speaker's purpose was "trivial," or "of too little significance for a man of his status or reputation." Perhaps the critic believes that the purpose was "so grandiose" that persuasion could simply not bring it about. While these judgements should not cause the critic to reject the speech <u>per se</u>, these considerations should affect his critical judgment of the persuasion involved.

## II. <u>The Scene of Persuasive Discourse</u>

NOTE: The following materials may be read by the teacher to the class, or modified to suit the teachers' needs and backgrounds.

If we are going to be able to evaluate persuasive discourse with any thoroughness, we must consider the

scene in which it took place. To make this point apparent, we need only to think of comparing two speeches: let us take Patrick Henry's "Give Me Liberty" speech and Franklin Roosevelt's First Inaugural Address. We need to know what prompted Henry's speech; that is, unless we know the scene in which Henry spoke, we will never be able to understand what the phrase "Give me liberty or give me death" has reference to. Similarly, when we hear the phrase of Roosevelt, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself," we must know why Roosevelt would make reference to fear, what the scene was in which he spoke, and how he responded to the scene.

Perhaps it would be best to attempt some definition of scene. We have already suggested a brief definition from Burke: When and where it was done. Now it is time to build on that short phrase. Suppose we were to use as another phrase for the "scene," the "climate of opinion." What does the phrase, "climate of opinion" mean to you? What would you say is the climate of opinion prevailing in America today?

NOTE: The teacher may wish to elicit from the students a discussion of the economic, social, political, and ideological values and problems within a society, It might be interesting to have the class try to describe the "climate of opinion" in the U.S. today. One generalization from this discussion may emerge clearly: it is very difficult and complex to describe completely the "climate of opinion" for any given culture at any given time.

Generally we mean by scene the political, economic, social, and ideological "climate of opinion" present in a given society at a particular point in time. We mean by "climate of opinion" the general prevailing sentiment by a particular group or culture. If one were, for example, going to study the sermons of Jonathan Edwards, we would have to go back to the "puritan scene." We would have to try to assess the "climate of opinion" for that period

Lecture-Discussion Continued

of the eighteenth century during which Edwards was so prominent.

Susanne K. Langer has observed "Every society meets a new idea with its own concepts, its own tacit, fundamental way of seeing things; that is to say, with its own questions, its peculiar curiosity." The critic of persuasive discourse needs to be familiar with the "fundamental way of seeing things" for the period in which the persuader operated. He cannot simply borrow questions from 1965 in the twentieth century and apply them without modification, let us say, to the period of the First World War. Suppose you wanted to study the persuasion of Erick Marie Remarque, perhaps in the novel All Quiet on the Western Front. The critic would need to look at the period and problems which Remarque found (the war, its background, its effects) in order to evaluate the persuasiveness of Remarque's masterful novel.

We have talked generally about the historical--cultural scene. The critic should also be aware of the immediate scene: that is, what prompted the particular persuasion you are studying? If we were studying the Douglas MacArthur Address to Congress (as we will be later on), we could sketch the general scene by talking about the Cold War, the Korean War and its effects. But the immediate scene, that which prompted the MacArthur speech, was one in which Truman fired MacArthur (and we need to find the reasons) and MacArthur returned to a hero's welcome in America, and was asked to address

Lecture-Discussion Continued

Congress. Often the persuasive discourse is prompted by a specific event within the scene, and is designed to meet a specific situation. For example, in 1952 Richard Nixon was accused of having a secret campaign fund. The effect of this disclosure was so strong that the Republicans were considereing removing him from the ticket. When he gave the persuasive speech (which we have now popularly called the "checkers speech") it was designed to meet the specific situation: that is, his future was at a stake. He needed to clear his name if he was to remain on the ticket. Here the immediate scene provided an event which prompted the speech: the speech was designed to meet the specific situation.

We need to make two more comments about the critic analyzing the scene. We have commented in the unit on evocation that we should be interested in the ration between scene and agent. By this we mean that the scene affects the agent and the agent the scene. This leads the critic to two important questions:

NOTE: the teacher may wish to refer back to the unit on evocation.

1. What is the effect of the scene upon the speaker?
2. What is the effect of the speaker upon the scene?

If we are aware of these questions, we will realize that the scene is not static, that the persuader is affected by the scene and in turn often affects the scene. The critic must necessarily be aware of the relationship or tension between the scene and persuader, and between the persuader and the scene.

Lecture-Discussion
Continued

III. The Agent of Persuasion

The third consideration of the critic of persuasive discourse should be the agent. Who did it? This question may seem simple at first, but it has difficulties involved.

If we ask, who is the persuader in All Quiet on the Western Front, we would probably respond, the author, Remarque. If we ask, who is the persuader in the First Inaugural Address of Franklin Roosevelt, we would respond, "Why Roosevelt, of course," But here we run into difficulties. We know that Roosevelt had a team of writers who "helped with" his major addresses. We know that others in addition to Roosevelt helped create the speech. Is Roosevelt the only persuader? This is a common problem in the twentieth century in analyzing the persuasion of especially prominent political figures. Roosevelt had his "brain trust." Truman and Eisenhower used ghost writers for their speeches. Kennedy had a famous team of writers, including two persons now writing about their experiences: Ted Sorenson and Arthur Schlesinger. Johnson also uses speech writers. Insofar as the persuader takes responsibility for the statements he makes, whether or not there were ghost writers present, we can say he was the persuader, or at least the primary persuader. But we should not forget that there may have been others working to prepare the persuasive discourse.

Similarly, we may study the persuasive discourse of a movement, when there are many persuaders. If one wanted to study the persuasion of the AMA against Medicare,

Lecture-Discussion Continued

for example, there would be numerous persuaders; there would also be the problem that some of the persuasion the AMA produced was done by a committee and we will not be able to determine who had responsibility for what part of the persuasion. In the study of the isolationists of the 1940's, contained in the back of the unit, there were over seventy different persuaders giving hundreds of speeches as well as pamphlets, movies, and letters written by committees. Hence a finding out the "agent" is not always a simple task.

Let us assume we know who the agent is. We need to ask, "What do we know about the agent?" "What do we know about his background?" Sometimes in order to know why the speaker chose a certain persuasive message we need to know his background. What is there is Daniel Webster's background, for example, which would explain why he chose to speak for the Comprise of 1850?

What do we know about the philosophy of the agent? What are his major assumptions? What are his habits of thinking? If we were going to study the persuasion of Bertrand Russell, for example, we would need to know his underlying philosophy and assumptions.

One way to find out a persuader's "habits of thinking" is to investigate other speeches, novels, essays he has written. Do they help reveal the man? We need to know whether the persuasive discourse we are criticizing is typical of the persuader. One of the best ways to undertake this task is to study both

Lecture-Discussion Continued

both his life and his writings. The critic should be interested in other persuasive discourse produced by the agent.

Professor A. Craig Baird has commented regarding speakers, "The effective speaker has mental range and consistency of principles." Thus the critic should ask, "What are these intellectual traits?" What Professor Baird has said about the speaker is no less true of the writer. Whether the persuasive discourse be written or oral, the critic must ask these questions if he is to be able to understand the "agent".

III. The Act: Or What Was Done

NOTE: The distinction made below between act and agency may be one with which the teacher disagrees. It is an interpretation of Burke, an application of which the teacher may have difficulty. It is possible to consider the "speech" or "essay" as the act, but then we need to ask, "What is the agency?" Since the agency usually concerns the manipulation of linguistic symbols, the materials were divided as they are found here.

In answer to the question concerning persuasive discourse, "What was the Act," we will usually say, "A speech," or "an editorial" or "a novel." By act we usually mean the "finished product" which is the form the persuasion took. Some persuaders prefer to give speeches; others to write editorials. But in answering the question, "What is the Act," we usually look at the form of the persuasive discourse.

Within the form of the discourse, the critic needs to treat the ideas of the persuasion. What were the major ideas? How did the persuader develop his central argument? (Or to borrow the terminology from the argumentation unit): "What were the claims of the persuader?" "What data was brought to bear upon those claims?" "What were the warrants which allowed the persuader to move from the data to the claim?"

Lecture-Discussion
Continued

What we have discussed is a necessary step for the critic of persuasion, but it is just a first step. In this step we ask, "What happened?" "What were the persuader's arguments?" After we have determined what happened we may be in a position to answer the question, "How well did it happen?"

In other words, the critic of persuasion should evaluate both the claims and the data of the persuader. This is a difficult but necessary step for the critic. He must ask such questions as:

NOTE: The teacher may wish to draw these out of the class by asking "What questions do you think the critic should ask about the arguments and data of the persuasion you are analyzing?"

1. Are the arguments logically sound?
2. Is the data brought to bear upon the claims true? Valid? Relevant?
3. Do the warrants stated or implied allow the persuader to move from the data to the claims?
4. Are the arguments chosen appropriate to the persuader?
5. Are the arguments presented appropriate to the audience? (That is, is the agent analyzing his audience well?)
6. Are the arguments presented appropriate to the scene and the immediate context?

None of these are easy questions to answer, but they are necessary ones for the thorough analysis of persuasive discourse.

In other words, in analyzing the "act," we first need to ascertain what was done, and second, how well was it done. We have thus far discussed the arguments of the persuader. We should include a second consideration that of the organization of the ideas.

Lecture-Discussion Continued

Since even the best ideas may become clouded in disorganized discourse, the critic should first ask, "How are the ideas organized?" In other words, as with argument, the first step of the critic is to ask, "How is it done?" The second, and more difficult question, is, "How well is it done?"

We need to ask in evaluating the organization of the discourse, among others, the following questions:

1. Is there an integration of ideas?
2. Does the order of the ideas (both the major and minor ideas) increase the persuasiveness of the discourse?
3. Does the persuasion evidence a sense order which allows the audience or reader to move from one idea to the next easily?
4. What part do structural elements (such as transistions, recapitulations, etc.) play in the persuasive discourse? Do they aid or hinder the persuasive attempt?

In other words, with the arguments and their arrangement, the critic first needs to ask, "What happened?" and after answering this necessary but preliminary question, he is able to tackle the tougher question, "How well did it happen?"

Lecture-Discussion Continued

V. <u>The Agency: or How Did He Do It</u>

We have already answered part of the question, "How did he do it?" in our discussion of the arguments and arangement of the persuader. In answer to the question, "What is agency?" we need to reflect on how persuasion comes about.

NOTE: The teacher may wish to refer the student back to the Unit of Persuasion at this point.

We have argued that persuasion comes about by the manipulation of symbols. Most of these symbols are linguistic. (We have noted that sometimes one can enhance persuasion by the use of effective gesture in public speeches, but we will not call these linguistic symbols). Hence, persuasion is affecting someone about something through the primary use of linguistic symbols. The study of language which you are undertaking should provide you with information as to how symbols affect those who hear or read them, and we will not need to review these materials here.

We thus need to ask, "How did the persuader use linguistic symbols to effect persuasion?" A second, and more difficult question is, "How well did the speaker manipulate linguistic symbols to effect persuasion?"

Too often critics have the tendency to simply count linguistic devices as a way of evaluating the agency of the persuader. We often get comments like, "He used three metaphors," or "He employed simile heavily." In other words, we tend to simply list the devices a speaker used rather than to analyze how they were used.

Professor Marie Nichols makes this point clear when referring to the tendency of critics of speeches when she says, "For want of better methods, the rhetorical critic sometimes satisfies himself with a simple enumeration of stylistic devices of the speaker. Unless

Lecture-Discussion Continued

the enumerations are particularizations of the pervasive tones and effects sought by the speaker, such enumeration probably serves little purpose. We need to ask, "What is language doing to further the end of ingratiation or identification?"

While the listing of "devices" may be a useful first step for the critic, he cannot stop there. He needs to ask "How?" and "How well?" In terms of the purpose of the persuader, how well does his use of language enhance or detract from the goal he seeks. This is what Professor Hochmuth means when she says we need to ask what language is going to gain identification for the persuader.

Thus we have covered five categories of analysis for the study of persuasive discourse, whether it be oral (speeches) or written (essays, novels, etc.). We considered purpose (the why), scene (the when and where), the agent (the who), the act (the what), and the agency (the how).

With these categories in mind, it is now time to turn to the possible kinds of persuasive discourse which may be treated with the categories of Burke's pentad.

## MATERIALS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF PERSUASIVE DISCOURSE

NOTE: The following may be read as a lecture or form the basis for class discussion, depending upon the desire of the teacher.

Since persuasion occurs every day in an almost countless variety of situations, the student will find a wealth of persuasive discourse for criticism. However, there are problems involved in selecting the materials for criticism.

Discussion Continued

Most persuasion which occurs is not recorded; it is lost to the critic. Even many important speeches may be lost if the speaker did not keep a manuscript, since even those speeches which are taped by radio stations are not kept indefinitely. It is difficult to deal thoroughly with discourse which is not recorded or printed, since the critic will want a chance to go back over the persuasion as many times as he feels is necessary to make his analysis complete. This does not mean that the critic should avoid analyzing speeches which he has heard but which were not recorded. But he should realize the limitations of criticism of those persuasive attempts which he hears but once.

NOTE: The teacher may wish to place the following three divisions on the board.

Basically, we can classify the materials for criticism into three categories:

1. The single unit of persuasive discourse.
2. The persuasive discourse of a person.
3. The persuasive discourse of a movement.

---

Sample Lecture

I. THE SINGLE UNIT OF PERSUASIVE DISCOURSE

The single unit of persuasive discourse should be welcomed by the critic for it can be analyzed more quickly and concisely than the discourse of a man or movement. What we mean by the single unit of discourse is a single speech or single essay or single novel. We might analyze, for example, John F. Kennedy's speech before the Houston ministers in September of 1960 (the speech which did more than anything else to take religion out of the 1960 campaign).

NOTE: For a sample analysis of a single speech (Lincoln's First Inagural), see Marie Hochmuth's essay in American Speeches (New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1954).

The critic could also analyze a single essay; let us take an essay by Walter Lippmann as an example. Without necessarily reading all of Lippmann's work, you could analyze, following the format we have discussed, a single essay. It should be noted here, however, that reading additional Lippmann essays or editorials may give you added insight into the analysis of this specific essay. One could do a persuasive analysis of Ambrose Bierce's short story, "Chickagauga," in an effort to determine how this persuasive discourse about war should be evaluated. And finally, the critic could analyze a single novel, such as George Orwell's 1984 or Robert Penn Warren's All the King's Men and provide rich insights into persuasive discourse.

## II. THE PERSUASIVE DISCOURSE OF A PERSON

If one were to study the persuasive discourse of a person, he would try to locate all the speeches and writings of that person during his lifetime. Of course, the critic might desire practically to limit his study of this person on a certain topic or to a certain period, as, for example, considering the foreign policy speeches of FDR, or the short stories of war by Ambrose Bierce, or the speeches and essays of William Graham Sumner on the issue of free trade. The materials available to the critic as well as his purpose will dictate how much of the persuasive discourse of a persuader the critic can discover and analyze. Ideally, the criticism of the total efforts

Lecture Continued

of a persuader would be undertaken. Yet for a man such as William Jennings Bryan, who was an active persuader for over thirty years, this would present the critic with a monumental task.

If the critic could assemble all the speeches, essays, etc., of a certain persuader, he should then seek to uncover the major persuasive issues which concerned the persuader. The critic would necessarily have to cut across the persuasive discourse to uncover the major patterns which characterize the persuader, since the critic cannot possibly encompass all aspects of the total of the persuader's discourse. In other words, the critic must be selective. He must search for what is characteristic of the persuader, of that which best illuminates the persuasion of the person being studied.

The critic should be alert, however, for changes in the basic argumentative stance of the persuader. Over a period of time, did the persuader change his attitude toward a given topic? Could we say that the persuasion of Lyndon Johnson, for example, reveals a change in attitude toward the issues of segregation and intergration? If we were to study Arthur Vandenburg, long a major figure in the U. S. Senate in the 1930's and 1940's, we would find that his attitude toward U. S. participation in world affairs underwent a complete reversal as a result of World War II. In 1939 Vandenburg would have opposed the United Nations (had it been proposed then) strongly; in 1946

Sample Lecture
Continued

he was one of its leading supporters. Studying the persuasive discourse of a man over a period of time may reveal basic changes in his attitudes toward controversial topics. It has often been said that a man changes as he gets older: the "causes" for which he fought in his youth are gone by the time he reaches forty. If this assumption is true, studying the persuasion of a man over a period of time should reveal these basic changes. In fact, this is one of the advantages of studying the discourse of a man, for it allows us to see the whole range of his persuasive choices and strategies. In studying the single speech or novel or essay, we may be unaware that a later work repudiated the persuader's earlier effort.

NOTE: The teacher may want to gather names from the class as to possible men to study and write them on the board.

If you were to pick a man to study, which persuader would you pick? A living one or a historical persuader? Who are some of the men you would find interesting to select? (After class suggestions, the teacher might include, if not mentioned: Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Orwell, James Baldwin, Truman, Kennedy, Penn Warren, Lionel Trilling, etc. This list is endless.)

## III. THE PERSUASIVE DISCOURSE OF A MOVEMENT

If you were asked to name a contemporary movement, which would you pick. Most of you probably thought of the civil rights movement. We can, perhaps, examine what we mean by a movement by taking a look at the civil rights movement.

Lecture Continued

The first noticeable attribute of the civil rights movement is that a number of speakers and writers (i.e., persuaders) are banded together in a common cause. How many persuaders are involved in the civil rights movement is difficult to discover. We immediately think of Martin Luther King, the leader. In other words, a movement usually has some acknowledged leadership. We might also consider his immediate lieutenants, many of whom give speeches at various rallies.

In the civil rights movement, we have not only the national leaders, but the leaders of the various states as well. Since the civil rights movement is tied to the NAACP, those persuaders in the NAACP would certainly have to be considered as persuaders in this movement. But what about the Black Muslims? Certainly they are trying to persuade the Negro people to follow a certain course. Should they be considered part of the civil rights movement?

We need , in other words, to make a limitation as to what we mean by a movement. Sometimes that limitation will be artificial; we may have to make an argument for limiting our investigation to a certain area. Movements, typically have many members giving speeches, writing editorials and other works, which makes the study of the persuasion of movements difficult. We obviously cannot study all the persuasion of all members. If we were to study all the persuasion of isolationists, let us say, before World War II, our study would have to be more of

Lecture-Continued

than a thousand speeches.

Consequently, as with studying a man, there is the need to make limitations and to work to uncover the "essence" of the persuasion of the movement--that is, those patterns of persuasion which predominate within the movement. Again, the critic must be selective. Since he cannot encompass all the discourse of the movement, he must select carefully that discourse which best characterizes the movement.

Other than the civil rights movement, there are many movements both historical and contemporary worth studying. Can you think of some prominent movements in which persuasion was critical if they were to achieve?

NOTE: The teacher may want to list on the blackboard responses from the class, and perhaps to as K some others.

To name just a few movements which could be studied: the abolitionist movement, the movement for woman suffrage, for prohibition, for isolation, against isolation, for civil rights, etc. Almost whenever you find a social cause, you will find some movement attached to it. If you consider the period of the Populists, and the period of the Progressive Reform, you will find this illustrated. There are numberous movements in America, and almost all of them have sought their goals by way of persuasion. Hence they are open to study.

These, then, are the three general types of material open for criticism: the single unit of persuasive discourse, the persuasive discourse of a person, and the persuasive discourse of a movement.

Let us now illustrate one kind of persuasive discourse. Let us take the persuasive analysis of one single event and ask how it should be analyzed. We take, in this case, a speech. First we will set up those questions we should ask. Then we will apply them to one specific speech--of Douglas MacArthur.

The following set of questions is meant to serve as a guide to speech criticism. It may be used as the framework for a term project by the student. Parts of this outline may be used in class in analyzing speeches selected by the teacher. It should be noted that not all questions will apply with equal force to all speeches. Some may not apply at all. This format need not suggest the format for the student term paper. It is merely meant as a guide, and the answers to these questions may well provide ample materials for the term paper of the student.

NOTE: The teacher may want to remind the student of the way in which "scene" was considered in the unit on evocation (1202).

NOTE: The teacher may want to underline the problem of twentieth century discourse of the multiple audience; that is, a speaker may confront an immediate audience and a larger, more remote radio or television audience. It

## A FORMAT FOR THE ANALYSIS OF A SINGLE SPEECH

### PART I: PLACING THE SPEECH IN A MEANINGFUL CONTEXT

I. A speech is part of and can only be understood in terms of its context or scene, i.e., the political, social, and intellectual background from which it arises and which in turn in may affect.

   A. What can be said about the historical scene?

      1. Of what series of events is the speech a part?

      2. How would you describe the "climate of opinion" prevailing in the scene?

      3. Of what immediate events does the speech seem to be a part?

      4. Does the speech seem to be a response to a particular event or series of events in the scene?

II. A speech is ordinarily directed toward a specific audience.

   A. What kind of a speech is it?

      1. political?
      2. Forensic, i.e., legal?
      3. Ceremonial?
      4. Lecture?
      5. Other?

   B. Who composes the audience? The immediate audience? The larger audience?

      1. What do you know about the attitude of the audience toward the speaker?

is possible that a speech may be appropriate for the immediate audience, but less appropriate for the television audience, as in, for example, the television broadcasts of some political convention speaking.

2. What do you know about the attitudes of the audience toward the subject of the speaker?

3. What do you know about the attitudes of the audience toward the occasion?

C. By what other immediate influences is the audience affected?

1. Other speeches, occuring before or after the presentation of the speech being studied?

NOTE: The student will have to research the specific speech situation since standard anthologies of speeches usually do not contain this information.

2. Was the speaker introduced? How was the speaker introduced? Was the introduction designed to enhance the "ethos" (image) of the speaker?

3. Other details of the speech situation?

D. Is there evidence to indicate that the speaker's purpose is to express himself or to get his ideas "on the record" in spite of (that is, almost ignoring) the immediate audience?

III. The speech is the product of a speaker, of a man.

NOTE: The student will not be able to use all biographical date relevant to the speaker. Some details of biography are irrelevant to his speaking. The teacher may wish to caution the student to include only that biographical data pertinent to the analysis of his speaking.

A. Who is this man?

1. General biographical data?

2. Education?

3. Speech training?

B. What is the relationship of this speech to his work, to the course of his life?

1. Is there a reldtionship to his other speeches or writings?

2. Is there a relationship to his immediate activity?

C. What is his experience and practice as a speechmaker?

1. What do you know about his habits of preparation?

2. What do you know about his habits of delivery?

3. Did he ever venture opinions about speechmaking?

4. Did he ever enunciate a theory of speechmaking?

PART II. ANALYZING THE SPEECH ITSELF

I. Is the text of the speech authentic?

A. What is the source of the text? Newspapers? Magazines? Congressional Publications? Anthologies?

B. How was the text produced? From the speakers manuscript? From a shorthand transcription? From a taped recording of the speech?

C. Was the text edited before it was printed?

1. Was the text edited by the speaker himself?

2. Was the text produced by a friendly biographer?

3. How soon after the delivery of the speech was the text released?

4. Are there other copies of the text available?

II. What can we say about the integrity of ideas?

A. What is the purpose of the speech? Is the purpose stated or implied?

B. What is the proposition of the speech?

1. What is the speaker's position on the proposition relative to that of the audience?

2. Are you able to outline the major ideas?

3. Are the major ideas outlined in logical sequence?

4. Are the major ideas outlined into a unified whole?

NOTE: The student may not be able to do much with the problem of textual accuracy or the writing of the text, but he should be aware of the problem.

NOTE: The teacher may want to caution the student that the printed text may bear little resemblance to the speech delivered. Daniel Webster, for example, improved his texts for as long as a year before they were published. The present copy of Patrick Henry's "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" was prepared not by Henry, but by William Wirt a friendly biographer, not at the time of the speech but fifty years later. Wirt never heard Henry speak, yet he is responsible for the standard text which bears Henry's name.

C. Are there any fundamental assumptions or premises upon which the thought of the speech seems to rest?

D. What is the relation of the ideas in this speech to the general thought of the speaker?

III. The traditional method of gaining insight into the speech.

A. Invention: How are the ideas chosen and given substance which will make them effective?

1. Argument: What are the major arguments of the speech?

a. What are the major claims of the speech?

b. What data is brought to bear on the claims presented?

c. What are the warrants relating the data to claim in the arguments?

d. Are the warrants stated or implied? Was it necessary to state some warrants which were implied?

e. Are there any reservations present for the claims chosen?

f. Are the claims qualified in any way?

g. Is any backing for warrant provided?

h. Do you think that any additional warrants should have backing for this audience?

i. Do you find examples of the established claim for one argument serving as warrant or data for succeeding arguments?

j. Do you find many examples of arguments which are chained? (That is, one argument follows because a prior argument has been established?)

k. Was sufficient data brought to bear to establish the claim under consideration?

NOTE: The teacher may wish to refer the student back to the materials on the nature of argument in unit 1103 on argumentation. A short review of the Toulmin model of analysis may make the application here more meaningful.

NOTE: The student will probably not be able to treat all of the claims in the speech. However, he should consider the major claims of the speech.

NOTE: The student may want to diagram several of the arguments for his own purposes of analysis. Whether or not he would provide such diagrams in the paper would depend upon the judgment of the teacher. It should be noted, however, that the simple act of diagramming a single 20 minute speech using the Toulmin model is a massive undertaking.

NOTE: The teacher may wish to refer the student back to or review those aspects of the Unit on Perusasion (1102), especially the section on motivation.

1. How would you evaluate the quality of the data brought to bear?

2. Were there non-logical appeals in effecting persuasion? (This idea is based traditionally on the notion that the speaker must adapt to or adjust his thought to the nature and needs of the audience.)

   a. Does the speech reveal that the speaker was aware of the motives in his audience?

   b. Did the speaker refer to or make use or subsistence motives?

   c. Did the speaker refer to or make use of social approval motives?

   d. Did the speaker refer to or make use of conformity motives?

   e. Did the speaker refer to or make use of mastery motives?

   f. In your judgment, was the speaker skillful in manipulating the motives of his audience?

   g. Were the speaker's arguments tied to the motives of the audience?

   h. Were the speakers arguments tied to the values of the audience?

   i. In your judgment, has the speaker analyzed and adapted to the human needs, cultural values, and attitudes of his audience?

3. What can you say about persuasive appeals based on the audience's perception of the speaker's character? (Ethos.)

   a. What was the reputation which the speaker brought to the specific speech situation?

   b. Was there anything in the specific situation (such as the introduction by another person) to enhance his reputation?

NOTE: The teacher will want to refer the student back to the discussion of "ethos" presented in Unit on Persuasion (1102).

c. Can you find any examples within the speech itself designed to enhance the reputation of the speaker?

d. Which of Walter's "patterns of ethos" (if any) do you feel the speaker tried to achieve?

e. Did the audience consider him in the "hero" pattern?

f. Did the speaker attempt to evoke the "hero" pattern of ethos?

g. Did the audience tend to perceive the speaker as the agent or specialist pattern of ethos?

h. Did the speaker try to establish any ideas which would provide him with agent ethos?

i. Did the audience tend to perceive the speaker within the "identification pattern of ethos?"

j. Did the speaker try to establish any ideas which would provide him with the "identification pattern of ethos?"

k. Did a single pattern of ethos predominate in the minds of his audience?

l. Did the speaker try to establish any ideas which would give indication that he sought one particular pattern of ethos?

NOTE: The teacher may wish to caution the student that no single pattern of ethos may be present, but a combination of patterns. Similarly it will be difficult to generalize about a specific pattern of ethos present in an audience, but the student may be able to comment generally about the reputation the speaker brought to the speech situation.

B. <u>Disposition</u> or Arrangement

1. Does the order of the major and/or minor parts increase the effectiveness of the speech?

2. Are the qualities of an orderly speech apparent?

   a. Clarity?
   b. Coherence?
   c. Unity?
   d. Emphasis?

3. Are the "traditional" parts of the speech apparent?

4. Does the introduction serve to get the attention of the audience?

5. Does the introduction serve to give the speech a sense of direction?

6. Was there a pattern of development in the body of the speech?

7. Is there an effective ordering of the parts and subordinating elements of the speech?

8. Does the conclusion provide a summary of the major ideas of the speech?

9. Does the conclusion seek to lead the audience to a specific course of belief or action?

10. What part do structural elements in the speech play?

    a. How well does the speaker use transistions in the speech?

    b. Does the speaker use recapitulations during the speech?

    c. Does the speaker use devices for making the structure of the speech apparent, such as numbering?

C. <u>Style</u>: Is the language of the speech effective?

1. Does the exemplify the qualities of good style?

    a. Is the language of the speech correct?

    b. Is the language of the speech clear?

    c. Is there any evidence that the speaker is trying to obscure ideas?

    d. Is the language of the speech appropriate to the speaker?

    e. Is the language of the speech appropriate to the audience?

    f. Is the language of the speech appropriate to the occasion?

g. Is the language of the speech appropriate to the topic?

NOTE: The teacher may want to refer the student back to Unit 1102, especially to the treatment of language in persuasion.

2. What stylistic devices seem to be either typical of the speech or seem to add significantly to its effectiveness?

   a. Did the speaker choose to use metaphor?

   b. How effective was the use of metaphor?

   c. Did the speaker use irony?

   d. Were there any examples of slanting?

   e. Did the speaker use language suggesting two-valued orientation?

   f. Did the speaker choose to use metonymy?

   g. Did the speaker choose to use synechodoche?

   h. How prevalent was the use of stylistic devices?

   i. How effective was the use of stylistic devices?

NOTE: Unless there is a recording, or a video-tape, or unless the student witnessed the speaker in person (or on television) the student may have to rely on secondary statements and comments on the speaker's delivery.

D. <u>Delivery</u>: Is information available concerning the manner and effectiveness of presenting the speech?

1. What was the mode of presentation?

   a. Manuscript?
   b. Impromptu?
   c. Extemporaneous?

2. What can you say about the speaker's physical activity?

3. What can you say about the speaker's use of voice?

PART III: THE EFFECTS OF THE SPEECH

A. What do you know about immediate effects?

1. Is there any tangible evidence of a shift of opinion within the audience?

2. Was there use of any type of votes or polling devices to indicate the audience response?

3. Was the audience allowed to respond to the speech by asking questions afterward?

4. Was there contemporary comment about the speech?

B. What do you know about ultimate effects?

1. Have there been comments by speech critics?

2. Have there been comments by historians?

3. Have there been comments by political critics?

4. How does the speech seem to relate to subsequent thought?

5. How does the speech seem to relate the subsequent history?

6. Do later events seem to justify or deny the speaker's endeavor?

## DISCUSSION OF THE MACARTHUR SPEECH TO CONGRESS

### PART I: PLACING THE SPEECH IN A MEANINGUL CONTEXT

NOTE: The teacher may want the student to apply the categories for the analysis of a specific speech. The Douglas MacArthur speech to the Congress is suggested. See: The Speaker's Resource Book (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1961), pp. 273-290. It will be necessary for the student to do additional research to answer the questions about the speech. The following discussion is presented for the teacher. The teacher may want additional materials other than those briefly supplied as answers to the questions. The answers to the questions are merely provded as a guide to discussion of the MacArthur speech.

NOTE: The questions are not meant to be completely separate All parts of 1-2-3-4 are meant to answer questions IA.

I. A speech is part of and can only be understood in terms of its context or scene, i.e., the political, social, and intellectual background from which it arises and which in turn it may affect.

A. What can be said about the historical scene? Here the student may mention the Cold War situation since 1946, especially the Progress of the Korean War. He may want to find out how the war was going at the same time Truman recalled MacArthur.

1. Of what series of events is the speech a part?

Here the student may mention the progress of the Korean War, the entry of the Chinese Communists, our reverses.

2. How would you describe the "climate of opinion" prevailing in the scene? Here the student may mention MacArthur's popularity based on World War II and his position in Japan. He may also note the storm of criticism which followed Truman's dismissal, and the reception which MacArthur received on his return.

3. Of what immediate events does the speech seem to be a part?
Entry into Korea of the Chinese Reds; MacArthur's insistence that Manchuria and perhaps even China be bombed. Truman's refusal and finally dismissal of the general. Finally of his return to the United States and invitation to speak before Congress.

4. Does the speech appear to be a response to a particular event or series of events in the scene?
Definitely; if he had not been fired he probably would not have been asked to speak. It was unusual for Congress to ask a military commander in the field to address a legislative body.

NOTE: It is difficult to generalize about the Congressional audience other than a breakdown of political affiliation, but several congressmen did make statements about MacArthur both before and after the speech. The comments about the general American audience will have to be generalizations of a somewhat sweeping nature, but the student should not be discouraged from making these; hopefully he will have some good reasons for making a given generalization.

II. A speech is ordinarily directed toward a specific audience.

A. What kind of a speech is it?
Difficut to classify in a single category; probably a combination of political and ceremonial. The speech is somewhat unique in that it stands a kind of testimony to a man's life.

B. Who composes the immediate audience? Who composes the larger audience?
Immediate: Congressmen and Supreme Court Justices. Larger: National audience, but speech would affect international audiences as well. MacArthur was probably aware of both audiences.

1. What do you know about the attitudes of the audience toward the speaker?
Generally well respected in the immediate audience: Congress conferred upon him a great honor by asking him to speak.

2. What do you know about the attitudes of the audience toward the subject of the speaker?
Generally favorable; in a sense Congress wanted the opinions of the Commander in the field on the issue which dominated the national scene.

3. What do you know about the attitudes of the audience toward the occasion?

Congress met in joint session: this was obviously an occasion of importance. Further, they may gave known that this would be the last major speech of MacArthur. The occasion was a dramatic one.

C. By what other immediate influence is the audience affected?
The students may suggest one or more of the following: The appearance of a "task" force of officers who served under him in the Pacific: they entered the hall ten minutes before he did. Group included his son. MacArthur was brought to the rostrum escourted by a courtesy committee, headed by William F. Miller.
MacArthur was briefly introduced by House Speaker Sam Rayburn: "Members of the Congress I deem it a high privilege, and I take great honor in presenting to you General of the Army Douglas MacArthur," A two minute ovation preceded the introduction.

III. The speech is the product of a speaker, of a man.

A. Who is this man?
Here the student may include such biographical data as his birth (January 26, 1880), his military education and honors (highest four year average ever achieved) at West Point, his service in the First World War, his position as commandant at West Point, his first retirement from the Army in 1937 and position in the Philippines, his recall to active duty in 1941, his escape from Corregidor in 1942, his "return" his presiding over the Japanese surrender, his direction of the American occupation of Japan, his command of the United Nations troops, his recall.
His trademarkes, much loved by cartoonists, were his gold braided cap and his corn cob pipe, which have become part of American folklore.

B. What is the relationship of this speech to his work, to the course of his life?
The speech came as a direct result of his work, and was a culmination of his life's work. It was to change his life, as he entered civilian life until his death.

C. What is his experience and practice as a speechmaker?
As part of the military he gave few speeches, but often spoke to the press (one of Truman's sources of irritation). He gave several speeches at West Point. One may want to compare this speech to his farewell to the cadets.

## PART II: ANALYZING THE SPEECH ITSELF

NOTE: Several versions are available of the MacArthur speech. There is a recorded version of the speech still available The New York Times carried the text of the speech. Many recent speech anthologies contain the speech. A good text is available in Arnold, Ehninger, and Berber eds., The Speaker's Resource Book. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1961, pages 273-290.

I. Is the text of the speech authentic?

A. What are the sources of the text?
Newspapers and speech anthologies. Speech was reprinted in the Congressional Record.

B. How was the text produced?
From a taped recording of the speech.

C. Was the text edited before it was printed?
The general text we have was not edited, and corresponds almost exactly to the recorded version.

II. What can we say about the integrity of ideas?

A. What is the purpose of the speech?
In part, to inform Congress as to the real situation in the Far East; in reality, to gain justification for his decisions and his contribution to national service. It is almost like a man on trial who chooses to defend himself.

B. What is the proposition of the speech?
Specifically, that our course of action in Korea was in error. More generally, that MacArthur has the best grasp of what our Far Asian policy should be.

C. Are there any fundamental assumptions or premises upon which the thought of the speech seems to rest?
The student may suggest one or more of the following:
That we must go all out in an effort to defeat Communism.
That we must defeat Communism.
That MacArthur is in the best position to speak on defeating Communism in Asia.
That MacArthur is an "expert" and we should rely on his opinions as proof for his claims.

III. The traditional method of gaining insight into the speech.

A. Invention: How are the ideas chosen and given substance which will make them effective?

1. Argument: What are the major arguments of the speech?
The student may suggest one or more of the following arguments, or suggest others not mentioned here:

Claim: The issues are global and interlocked.
Data: Europe is the gateway to Asia.
Asia is the gateway to Europe.
Warrant: What affects one part of the world will also affect the other.

Claim: Overthrowing Communism in Asia will weaken its advance in Europe.
Data: The Communist threat is global.
Warrant: Successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction in every other sector.

NOTE: The following list is but a sample of the major claims in the speech. Much of what constitutes data does so only insofar as the reader or listener accepts it as believable or accurate. It is typical of this speech that most of the warrants are authoritative; that is, they rely on our trust of the MacArthur to be able to make the claim from given data. In many of the arguments, the warrant is simply, "MacArthur is qualified to make such a statement." Once a claim has been established in this manner, it may be used as data for a later argument.

Claim: Formosa must not fall into Communist hands.
Data: The loss of Formosa would threaten the Philippines and even Japan.
Warrant: Successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction in every other sector.

NOTE: The student may observe that whether or not much "data" functions as evidence will depend upon whether or not he accepts the MacArthur data as being true and relevant. The speech may be a testimony to the effectiveness of the authoritative warrant for a specific person in a specific situation.

Claim: To understand China now, you must accept the past changes.
Data: Statement of past changes.
Warrant: Authoritative here: MacArthur asks you to accept the inference on the basis of his drawing of relationships.

Claim: The decision to fight in Korea was a sound one.
Data: My opinion and our victories.
Warrant: MacArthur is in a position to make a qualified observation in this area.

Claim: A new military situation must be met by new tactics.
Data: Entry by Red China presented a new military situation.
Warrant: Authoritative.

NOTE: The four suggestions for action in the Far East are not detailed. They rest as claims and data, to be believed or accepted insofar as one accepts the motivational warrant, that MacArthur is in a position to make such a statement.

Claim: We must intensify our economic blockade of Red China.
Data: Same as claim.
Warrant: Authoritative.

Claim: We must impose a naval blockade against China.
Data: Same as claim.
Warrant: Authoritative.

Claim: We must remove restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's costal area and of Manchuria.
Data: Same as claim.
Warrant: Authoritative.

Claim: Criticism of my policy in unjust.
Data: The Joint Chiefs supported it.
Warrant: The Joint Chiefs are in a position to know what is best military policy.

Claim: We must remove restrictions on Formosa.
Data: Same as claim.
Warrant: Authoritative.

Claim: I am not a warmonger.
Data: Statement at Japanese surrender.
Warrant: Statement is indicative of his high regard for peace.

Claim: It will not spread into an all out war.
Data: China is engaging with all the military power they can commit.
Warrant: A country using its full potential cannot use more.

Claim: Russia will not enter the war.
Data: Statement above and "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves.
Warrant: Authoritative.

NOTE: The teacher may well want to broaden the question concerning audience motivation to "How did the speaker adapt to and utilize motives in his audience?"

2. Were there non-logical appeals in effective persuasion?
Definitely: In fact many critics have argued that the major impact of the speech was caused by non-logical persuasion.

a. Does the speech reveal that the speaker was aware of the motives of his audience?
The student will probably argue that he was: the opening paragraphs 1-5 suggest this with regard to his immediate audience.

b. Does the speech reveal that the speaker was aware of subsistence motives?
Subsistence motives do not play a large part of the speech.

c. Did the speaker refer to or make use of social approval motives?
To some extent: direct the student to paragraphs 1-5, and 54-55.

d. Did the speaker make use of or refer to mastery motives?
Direct the student to paragraphs 3-5, 38-43, 52-55.

NOTE: All the suggested categories were not touched upon. The teacher may well want to add questions from the original list which he or she finds applicable to the MacArthur speech.

e. Were the speaker's arguments tied to the values of the audience?
Generally, MacArthur tied his arguments to the need to defeat Communism, to preserve liberty, to preserve the American way of life, to shed as little of American blood as possible, all values held to some degree by members of his audience.

3. What can you say about persuasive appeals based upon the audience's perception of the speaker's character?
A summary question: but it can probably by said that this aspect of MacArthur's speaking dominated the speech. Many of the arguments we are asked to accept are presented on the basis of MacArthur's "expertness."

a. What was the reputation which the speaker brought to the specific speech situation?
Well known and highly regarded. The students will probably cite some of the materials from his background covered in general biography on MacArthur.

b. Was there anything in the specific situation (such as the introduction by another speaker) to enhance his reputation?
The specific situation (a Congresional Address) enhanced his reputation; the presence of the honor guard helped as did the short introduction by the highly respected Sam Rayburn, quoted earlier.

c. Can you find any examples within the speech itself designed to enhance the reputation of the speaker?
There are many references to MacArthur's previous actions and opinions, all of which may have been designed for this purpose. More specifically, the student may want to comment on paragraphs 1-5 and 54-56 to answer this question.

d. Which of Walter's patterns of ethos do you feel the speaker tried to achieve?
Probably the hero pattern, the one which MacArthur as a military commander probably brought to the speaking situation. The student may find some indication of the "agent" pattern in paragraphs 5, 41-42, 54-56; and of the identification pattern in paragraphs 1-4, and 46. However, the hero pattern appears to dominate.

NOTE: There may be disagreement on the "patterns" here, but the "hero" pattern is most probably the dominant one. That is not to argue that there aren't aspects of the other patterns here.

NOTE: Question D is answered generally and hence questions h-1 are not taken up specifically here. The teacher may wish to consider some of them.

B. Disposition or Arrangement

1. Does the order of the major and/or minor parts increase the effectiveness of the speech?
Generally, the student will be able to follow the speech without difficulty; the general structure of the speech is one from the larger problem to the more specific problem: in effect MacArthur funnels the speech until it hits the specific focus. Direct the student to paragraph 37, where the speech is funnelled to the Korean conflict itself.

2. Are the qualities of an orderly speech apparent?
The student will probably comment that the speech is quite orderly.

3. Are the "traditional" patterns of the speech apparent?
Quite apparent.

4. Does the introduction serve to get the audience's attention and give the speech a sense of direction?
Paragraphs 1-5 serve as the introduction; it is designed to give attention but does not give the speech a sense of direction.

6. Was there a pattern of development in the body of the speech?
The organization of the speech was from the general (Asia as a whole) to the specific (Korea). In the last section he speaks of the problem in Korea now and his specific recommendations for a solution.

NOTE: Not all of the questions on arrangement are used here. The teacher may want to explore with the class several of the questions not treated here.

10. What part do structural elements in the speech play?
One of the major assets of the speech is MacArthur's excellent use of transistions. Direct the student to paragraphs 8, 16, and 37.

C. Style: Is the language of the speech effective?

1. Does the speech exemplify the qualities of good style?
Generally he does, but one should note that several of the critics in Appendix A disagree. Probably we could say that he is generally correct, appropriate to the occasion and the audience (certainly it is solemn and without humor, for which one critic attacked him). The language appears to be appropriate to the speaker, although one may question the final paragraph. It is likely that the students will agree that MacArthur used language that was appropriate to the speaker, topic, audience, and perhaps the occasion.

NOTE: You may wish to have students read examples of comments made by various critics of the MacArthur speech. Suggested source: The Speaker's Resource Book, Scott Foresman and Company, 1961.

2. What stylistic devices seem to be either typical of the speech or seem to add significantly to its effectiveness?
The student may cite some metaphors which are not particularly fresh: gateways to Europe, shackles of colonialism, etc. There is not a large use of metaphor, synechdoche or metonymy. The student may want to comment on the last paragraphs, from which the speech "Old Soldiers Never Die" received its popular name. Whether the choice of this saying was effective may well cause disagreement in the class.

D. Delivery: Is information available concerning the manner and effectiveness of presenting the speech?
Yes, there are recordings of MacArthur delivering the speech, as well as comments in Appendix A and elsewhere about his delivery.

1. What was the mode of presentation?
Manuscript.

2. What can you say about the speaker's physical activity?
Since the student did not see the speech, he will have to rely on the comments in Appendix A. Generally comments in this area are favorable.

3. What can you say about the speaker's use of voice?
Unless the student has heard the recording, he will probably have to rely on statements in Appendix A. Generally, comments are that his voice is deep, warm, and impressive. They note that he sounded "sincere" and "serious"; that is, that his voice suggested the gravity of the situation. Most critics consider MacArthur's voice one of his best speaking assets.

PART III: THE EFFECTS OF THE SPEECH

A. What do you know about the immediate effects?
We know that Congressional reaction was generally quite favorable, with some exceptions noted in Appendix A. There was no use of polls. Over thirty times he was interrupted by applause. He received a standing ovation. There were no questions. Some of the contemporary comment is contained in Appendix A. The student may seek more: The New York Times provided comment as did many of the weekly news magazines.

B. What do you know about the ultimate effects?
In terms of the ultimate effects, MacArthur was not reinstated; he became a private citizen and took an executive job with Remington Rand. His suggestion for a course of action toward Korea was not followed (nor was it brought up as a specific proposal by any of the Congressmen listening). Whether or not "history has vindicated MacArthur" may still be open to question. The student may want to compare his suggestions with the possible application to problems in Viet Nam. Appendix A provides some contemporary comments, but it will still be some time before a final historical evaluation of MacArthur is made.

## UNIT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is provided as an aid to the teacher who wants to read additional materials on the criticism of persuasive discourse. It is not meant to be exhaustive. Most of the following articles deal with the criticism of rhetoric, but the materials should be applicable to most aspects of criticism of persuasive discourse.

Baskerville, Barnett. "The Critical Method in Speech," Central States Speech Journal, July, 1953, 1-5.

Burke, Kenneth. Philosophy of Literary Form. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1941. Also available in paperback published by Vintage.

Griffin, Leland. "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1952, 184-188.

Hillbrunner, Anthony. "Creativity and Contemporary Criticism," Western Speech, Winter, 1960, 51-61.

Hochmuth, Marie. "Burkeian Criticism," Western Speech, Spring, 1957.

_____, "The Criticism of Rhetoric," in A History and Criticism of American Public Address, III. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956, 1-23.

_____, "Kenneth Burke and the New Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1952, 133-144.

Holland, Virginia. "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, December, 1955, 352-358.

_____. "Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method," Quarterly Journal of Speech, December, 1953, 444-450.

Lee, Irving. "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1942, 148-155.

Murphy, Richard. "The Speech as a Literary Genre," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1958, 117-127.

Nilsen, Thomas R. "Criticism and Social Consequences," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1956, 173-178.

Steele and Reading. "The American Value System: Premises for Persuasion," Western Speech, Spring, 1962, 83-91.